

MEMO

Date: March 13, 2000

To: Attendees of the March 1-3, 2000 HSRG meeting

From: Betsy Daniels

Re: Meeting summary, research decisions summary and task list

Purpose: The purpose of this three-day meeting was to bring together the members of the newly formed Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) for the first time. The agenda included a briefing on the background on the hatchery reform initiative; a review of budgets and scopes of work developed for the Congressional funding; a review of current state and tribal hatchery reform efforts; a review and discussion of the goals of hatchery reform, the objectives of the HSRG and a draft work plan; and the review and approval of grant applications of hatchery research.

Attendance:

In attendance for **March 1** were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW);
- Remaining Gorton Science Team members: Pete Bergman, Frank Haw, Terry Wright; and
- LLTK/ GTH facilitation and staff team members Barbara Cairns, Kathy Hopper, Betsy Daniels, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk.
- Advisor to US Senator Slade Gorton Gary Smith of the Gallatin Group presented from 1-2 pm
- The discussions on this day were facilitated by Jim Waldo.

The morning of the first day was dedicated to providing background on the Hatchery Reform initiative to the new members of the Hatchery Scientific Review Group. Gary Smith of the Gallatin Group attended in the early afternoon to present Senator Gorton's expectations for the process and the report due to Congress in June. The HSRG reviewed and discussed a draft work plan and timeline for the HSRG that outlined short term and long term tasks. The HSRG broke into two groups, where the independent scientists developed a draft outline for a decision-making framework and the agency representatives drafted a set of research priorities.

In attendance from 8:30 to 2:00 pm of **March 2** were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW),
- Facilitation and staff team members Kathy Hopper, Betsy Daniels, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk.

HSRG March 1-3 Meeting Summary

- Jim Waldo facilitated the discussions for this portion of the day.

Discussions began with each group presenting the draft decision frameworks they had completed the previous afternoon. The group came to agreement the purpose of hatcheries, the goal of hatchery reform and the primary objectives of the HSRG. From 11:00 – 12:00, WDFW representatives made a presentation on a gill net research proposal. After lunch, there was further discussion of work plan elements, staffing and administrative needs and the importance of a communications strategy to be developed and executed by LLTK.

In attendance from 2:00 to 5:00 pm of March 2 were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW),
- LLTK staff team member Kathy Hopper
- The discussions were led by Lee Blankenship and Connie Mahnken

Discussions focused on review, discussion and decisions on current grant proposals (see attached summary).

In attendance the morning of **March 3** were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW),
- LLTK staff team member Kathy Hopper
- The discussions were led by Lee Blankenship and Connie Mahnken
- Terry Wright (NWIFC) observed the process.

Discussions focused on completing the review and decisions on current grant proposals (see attached summary).

In attendance from 12:00 to 2 pm of March 3 of the meeting were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW),
- Remaining Gorton Science Team member: Terry Wright (NWIFC); and
- Facilitation and staff team members LLTK/ GTH facilitation and staff team members Barbara Cairns, Kathy Hopper, Betsy Daniels, Michael Kern, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk.
- Jim Waldo facilitated the discussions for this portion of the day.

Discussions focused on reviewing and updating a brief meeting summary prepared by the LLTK/ GTH team for a discussion item for the Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee meeting. The summary highlighted the purpose of hatcheries, the goal of hatchery reform, the objectives of the HSRG and near term tasks to be completed.

HSRG March 1-3 Meeting Summary

In attendance from 2:00 pm to 4:30 pm of March 3 (Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee meeting) were:

- Independent HSRG members: Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb, Bill Smoker and Lars Mobrand;
- Agency HSRG members John Barr (NWIFC), Conrad Mahnken (NMFS), Don Campton (USFWS), Lee Blankenship (WDFW);
- Remaining Gorton Science Team members: Pete Bergman, Frank Haw and Terry Wright;
- Facilitation and staff team members LLTK/ GTH facilitation and staff team members Barbara Cairns, Kathy Hopper, Betsy Daniels, Michael Kern, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk.
- NWIFC leadership Executive Director Jim Anderson, NWIFC Chairman Billy Frank, and NWIFC member Terry Williams;
- WDFW Policy representative Jim Scott;
- Kent Craford of US Senator Slade Gorton's Washington state office and Senator Gorton's advisor Gary Smith of the Gallatin Group
- Jim Waldo facilitated the discussions for this meeting.

Discussion focused on a repeat of Gary Smith's presentation on Senator Gorton's principles for salmon recovery, why the Senator supports hatchery reform and what would be most valuable for the HSRG and LLTK to include in the reports to Congress in June. Terry Wright described how the hatchery reform funding is currently being utilized by the tribes and the NWIFC. Lee Blankenship described how the hatchery reform funding is currently being utilized by WDFW. The Coordinating Committee also reviewed the draft framework and early research priorities developed by the HSRG (see Attachments 1 and 2) and expressed strong support for the HSRG's approach.

Decisions

During this first three-day meeting, the HSRG made the following decisions. The HSRG:

1. Recognized that the purposes of hatcheries are to:

- Provide for Sustainable Fisheries
- Recover and Conserve Naturally Spawning Populations

2. Described the Goal of Hatchery Reform:

To ensure that hatchery programs in Puget Sound and Coastal Washington are managed and operated in order to meet one or both of the two purposes for hatcheries identified above.

3. Agreed on the objectives of the Hatchery Scientific Review Group:

Based on an agreed upon framework and criteria for decision-making (to be developed):

1. Develop a framework to implement hatchery reform.
2. Work with tribal, federal and state agencies to review hatchery management plans and policies, and program implementation for scientific consistency with hatchery purposes and framework.
3. Identify scientific needs and make recommendations on further experimentation.
4. Develop a system to evaluate whether hatchery reform occurs (is implemented and results documented).

5. Work with Long Live the Kings to develop and implement a plan for communicating with agencies, scientific community, interested parties, and the public.

4. Agreed on the approach of the Hatchery Scientific Review Group:

Hatchery programs will be considered in the ecological context of each watershed, along with habitat and harvest risks and consistencies, as an integrated set of decisions, resulting in a regional hatchery reform program.

5. Agreed that the Hatchery Genetic Management Plans (HGMP's) currently being completed by the WDFW and tribes for each hatchery facility and species will:

- provide key information for the HSRG to evaluate the benefits and risks of hatchery practices
- serve as a major step forward for establishing baseline information.
- address immediate risks to ESA listed species

6. Must identify how the work of the HSRG is connected to the development of Comprehensive Species Plans (Comprehensive Coho, Chinook etc) and other management decisions.

7. Agreed that current work by the tribes and WDFW should continue although it may be refined by the recommendations of the HSRG and

- will help to identify goals/purpose
- should address immediate risks

8. Established a draft framework for hatchery reform from which the HSRG will evaluate hypotheses and make decisions and recommendations on hatchery reform (see Attachment 1 on draft framework).

9. Will compare the framework they develop to:

- HGMP's
- Existing Policies, Management Plans, and Programs

10. To address research needs for hatchery reform the HSRG will

- Fund initial grant decisions for early research needs (see Attachment 2 on early priorities)
- Develop research priorities and programs
- Recommend new research

11. The HSRG will operate initially through task teams and individual assignments

12. Program priorities include:

- Organize what we know
- We do know enough to take many actions now
- Involve hatchery managers in developing and implementing hatchery reform
- Good policies are necessary, good implementation is essential
- Science should guide both hatchery policy and implementation

13. Agreed that hatcheries need to be accountable for performance, therefore the HSRG needs to develop a system to evaluate performance (goals for facilities/programs) that takes into account:

- benefits
- risks
- value (benefits achieved for \$'s expended)

14. Agreed that there must be a relationship between scientific research and decisions:

- Research programs need to be directly connected to important management decisions
- Where interim management decisions must be made prior to obtaining sufficient scientific information, the decisions should reflect the level of confidence and/or uncertainty in the science and be tied into the research and monitoring programs in order to enhance future management decisions.
- The choice of taking no action has risks
- Adaptive management
- Describe the level of confidence the HSRG has in its decisions and compare management risks to implications of reducing uncertainty.

Action Items

The following action items were identified and assignments to achieve them were made.

1. Develop draft **outline to Congress** on progress and approach of the HSRG, the co-managers and LLTK [Outline to be developed by Barbara Cairns working with Don Campton, Connie Mahnken, and John Barr]
2. Development of an early outreach plan to include: (Completed draft due to LLTK by April 3 for distribution.)
 - **News releases** regarding formation of the HSRG, with **follow-up communication by WDFW and NWIFC leadership**. [Barbara Cairns will coordinate]
 - A proposed **approach for June presentation to Congressional representatives** (including format, who to invite, who presents what, outreach and communications needs) [To be developed by Barbara Cairns, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk]
 - **Early outreach to fishery and environmental leaders** on the hatchery reform process [To be developed by Barbara Cairns, Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk]
3. Refine and develop **framework** for hatchery reform [Lars Mobrand will circulate for HSRG input] – Completed draft due to LLTK by April 3 for distribution.
4. Review HSRG **work plan** and **timeline** to assess whether updated draft needed for April meeting [BJ Mirk/Michael Kern]
5. Establish **information base** for HSRG members (existing information and available resources) [Kathy Hopper and 4 agency reps] – for distribution at April meeting

HSRG March 1-3 Meeting Summary

6. Develop agenda for discussion of HSRG **research program** [Kathy Hopper with HSRG] – Completed draft due to LLTK by April 3 for distribution.
7. Develop description of **context and explanation for initial grant decisions**. [Lisa Seeb and Bill Smoker] – Completed
8. Implement decisions on first round of funded, deferred and rejected **research grants** [Lee Blankenship] – Progress report to be delivered at April meeting
9. **Contract administration** for HSRG costs with IAC [Lee Blankenship] – Progress report to be delivered at April meeting
10. Develop proposal for working with **co-manager science teams** (invite teams to portion of April meeting?) [John, Lee and Kathy] – Completed draft due to LLTK by April 3 for distribution.
11. Communicate with appropriate DC staff on **FY 2001 appropriations**. [Barbara Cairns will coordinate with Terry Wright, Pete Bergman, and Gary Smith] – Completed
12. Develop **agenda for April** meeting [BJ Mirk/Michael Kern with LLTK/GTH Team and HSRG members]
13. Logistics for April meeting location [LLTK]

Attachment 1: Draft framework for hatchery reform:

1. Provide for Sustainable Fisheries

What must be in place to achieve goal:

- a. Healthy Viable Populations
 - Productivity
 - Abundance
 - Diversity
 - Population Structure
- b. Harvest Access
 - No over harvest of natural stocks
 - No over harvest of hatchery stocks
 - No adverse selective fisheries
- c. Acceptable genetic or ecological impacts to ecosystem
- a. Accountability for performance
 - Clear statement of value or benefits to be achieved
 - Known measure of success
 - Accurate assessment and management of costs (cost-effective method of providing benefits)
- Use of least cost option to provide benefits

2. Recover and Conserve Naturally Spawning Populations

What must be in place to achieve goal

- b. Suitable broodstock
 - Productivity
 - Abundance
 - Diversity
 - Population structure
- c. Adequate protection of
 - Habitat
 - Harvest
- d. Risks associated with no action are considered (what is unacceptable?)
- e. Accountability for performance
 - Clear statement of value or benefits to be achieved
 - Known measure of success
 - Accurate assessment and management of costs (cost-effective method of providing benefits)
 - Use of least cost option to provide benefits

Attachment 2: Priorities for funding early research for initial review:

A. Sustainable Fisheries

- 1) Reduce Harvest on Wild fish
 - Selective Fisheries
 - ✓ Gear Development (that leads to selective fisheries)
 - ✓ Isolate runs in time and space
 - Mass Marking
- 2) Reduce Adverse genetic impacts of fishery harvest
 - Analyze impacts of current harvest activities on wild and hatchery fish

B. Protect Genetic Resources

- 1) Avoid adverse genetic interactions between hatchery and wild
 - ✓ Minimize straying of hatchery stocks to acceptable level
 - ✓ Minimize domestication of hatchery stocks
- 2) Avoid adverse ecological interactions
 - ✓ Mimic natural life history traits in terms of growth and environment
 - ✓ Avoid predation
 - ✓ Competition for food and space
 - ✓ Avoid/reduce disease transmission from hatchery to wild

C. Improve quality and cost-effectiveness of hatchery programs

- 1) Improve survival
 - ✓ Identification of carrying capacity
 - ✓ Disease prevention
 - ✓ Nutrition
 - ✓ Spawning protocols
 - ✓ Size and Time of release

D. Recover and Conserve Naturally Spawning Populations

- Viability of supplementation
- Captive broodstock
- Minimum viable population (for example: demographics of extinction, when to intervene to preserve mvp)
- Protect Genetic Resources

Consider Monitoring and Evaluation (Question: State and Tribal responsibilities v. research potential)

- Develop protocols for monitoring
- Cost-effectiveness

Attachment 3: Presentation by Gary Smith

Gary Smith of the Gallatin Group is an advisor to US Senator Slade Gorton on opportunities for salmon recovery in western Washington that the Senator could support. In his presentation to the HSRG he focused on three main points: Senator Gorton's principles on salmon recovery, why the Senator supports hatchery reform and what would be most valuable for the HSRG and LLTK to include in the reports to Congress in June.

Senator Gorton's principles on salmon recovery:

1. Science should inform decisions on hatcheries;
2. Programs need to be cost-effective (as a guiding principle);
3. As much as possible, solutions should be locally based;
4. Citizen involvement in salmon recovery efforts is vital to create understanding and support.

Why Hatchery Reform?

He emphasized that the Senator wanted to provide leadership on this issue and saw hatcheries as the "neglected H" in the four H's of salmon recovery. The Senator saw great potential in hatchery reform in terms of the greatest "bang for the buck". He also felt that Hatchery Reform would counter attempts to remove hatcheries and therefore fisheries and _ million sports fishers as key supporters of recovery plans. The science advisory team said well-managed hatcheries can help recover stocks and sustainable fisheries. The Senator has stressed that to be credible, hatchery reform must be science- not policy-driven. Gorton saw that he has a unique ability to direct appropriations to this task, which he views as a multi-year effort.

What would be most valuable for the report to Congress:

1. **Demonstrate progress:** The HSRG and LLTK reports are due to Congress on June 1, and must demonstrate progress even in this brief period of time, and in particular that this process has "traction." It is important that we demonstrate results and have a viable plan in place, so that Senator Gorton and Congressman Norm Dicks can defend the process.
2. **Cooperation:** Our reports should demonstrate that cooperation is central to the process and that this process is different from the status quo.
3. **Outreach:** Informing the public that the scientists and co-managers are committed to this process is important. At a minimum must show plans to involve and keep informed key constituents and interests, and provide a mechanism for addressing their concerns. Consider whether these are going to be open meetings, will you have a web site, etc.
4. **A plan:** A plan for implementing this hatchery reform initiative must be in place. The plan should establish the process for achieving hatchery reform, show clear goals, describe what success will look like, and have a timetable with milestones.
5. **A budget:** Within the report it will be important to be accountable for spending current funds with as many specifics as possible. Illustrating confidence in how this funding is allocated is important as well. Research requirements must focus on tangible, "real world" results. Provide concrete examples of how funding will be allocated over time. Funding for agency personnel over time will not be received well. It should be directed toward concrete needs.